PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINING AUTHORITY BARON & WARREN To: RECEIVED Johnstone, Douglas Ian 2 7 SEP 2004 **BARON & WARREN** NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL OF 19 South End, Kensington KSW 11 MBC 14 THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY London W8 5BU APW **EXAMINATION REPORT GRANDE BRETAGNE** 8608 TWP (PCT Rule 71.1) COMP. DIARY See Date of mailing (day/month/year) 27.09.2004 Applicant's or agent's file reference **IMPORTANT NOTIFICATION** MR/38024 International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) PCT/GB 03/02763 27.06.2003 28.06.2002 Applicant ALPHA THAMES LTD

- The applicant is hereby notified that this International Preliminary Examining Authority transmits herewith the international preliminary examination report and its annexes, if any, established on the international application.
- A copy of the report and its annexes, if any, is being transmitted to the International Bureau for communication to all the elected Offices.
- Where required by any of the elected Offices, the International Bureau will prepare an English translation of the report (but not of any annexes) and will transmit such translation to those Offices.

4. REMINDER

The applicant must enter the national phase before each elected Office by performing certain acts (filing translations and paying national fees) within 30 months from the priority date (or later in some Offices) (Article 39(1)) (see also the reminder sent by the International Bureau with Form PCT/IB/301).

Where a translation of the international application must be furnished to an elected Office, that translation must contain a translation of any annexes to the international preliminary examination report. It is the applicant's responsibility to prepare and furnish such translation directly to each elected Office concerned.

For further details on the applicable time limits and requirements of the elected Offices, see Volume II of the PCT Applicant's Guide.

The applicant's attention is drawn to Article 33(5), which provides that the criteria of novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability described in Article 33(2) to (4) merely serve the purposes of international preliminary examination and that "any Contracting State may apply additional or different criteria for the purposes of deciding whether, in that State, the claimed inventions is patentable or not" (see also Article 27(5)). Such additional criteria may relate, for example, to exemptions from patentability, requirements for enabling disclosure, clarity and support for the claims.

Name and mailing address of the international preliminary examining authority:



European Patent Office - P.B. 5818 Patentlaan 2 NL-2280 HV Rijswijk - Pays Bas Tel. +31 70 340 - 2040 Tx: 31 651 epo nl

Fax: +31 70 340 - 3016

Authorized Officer

Ter Haar, H

Tel. +31 70 340-3817



PATENT COOPERATION TREATY







INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

MR/3	38024	gent's file reference	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)		
	ational ap	plication No. 2763	International filing date (day/monthly 27.06.2003	Priority date (day/month/year) 28.06.2002	
	ational Pa 343/36	tent Classification (IPC) or	both national classification and IPC		
Applica ALPH		MES LTD	·		
1.	This inte	rnational preliminary ex and is transmitted to th	amination report has been prepared ne applicant according to Article 36.	by this International Preliminary Examining	
2.	This RFF	PORT consists of a tota	of 5 sheets, including this cover sh	neet.	
1	hee	en amended and are the	e basis for this report and/or sheets or the basis for this report and/or sheets on 607 of the Administrative Instruct	ne description, claims and/or drawings which ha containing rectifications made before this Autho ions under the PCT).	
-	,	nnexes consist of a total		·	
	This was	at contains indications	relating to the following items:		
3. I		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver	ntion	ntive step and industrial applicability	
3. I	Ø	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver	f opinion with regard to novelty, inve		
3.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents c	f opinion with regard to novelty, invention tunder Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to ations supporting such statement ited		
3.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents o Certain defects in the	f opinion with regard to novelty, invention t under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to ations supporting such statement ited e international application		
3.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents o Certain defects in the	f opinion with regard to novelty, invention tunder Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to ations supporting such statement ited		
3.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents c Certain defects in the Certain observations	f opinion with regard to novelty, invention t under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to ations supporting such statement ited e international application on the international application		
3.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents o Certain defects in the	f opinion with regard to novelty, invention t under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to ations supporting such statement ited e international application on the international application	o novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability	
3.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents c Certain defects in the Certain observations	f opinion with regard to novelty, invention t under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to ations supporting such statement ited e international application on the international application	novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability	
3.	I	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment o Lack of unity of inver Reasoned statement citations and explana Certain documents c Certain defects in the Certain observations	f opinion with regard to novelty, invention t under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to ations supporting such statement ited e international application on the international application Date of cor	novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability	

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/GB 03/02763

	m	•	. e .	.l		
I .	Has	is (OT	the	reb	oπ

1. With regard to the **elements** of the international application (Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17)):

		De	escription, Pages	· .
		1-	11	as originally filed
		Cla	aims, Numbers	
		1-1	·	filed with telefax on 06.08.2004
		1-	10	med with telefax on ob.ob.2004
		Dr	awings, Sheets	
		1/6	-6/6	as originally filed
	2.	. Wit	th regard to the lang t guage in which the in	age, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the ternational application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
		The	ese elements were av	railable or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:
			the language of a tr	anslation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
			the language of pub	lication of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
٠			the language of a translated the Rule 55.2 and/or 55	anslation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under 3).
	3.	Wit inte	h regard to any nucle ernational preliminary	ectide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:
			contained in the inte	rnational application in written form.
			filed together with th	e international application in computer readable form.
			furnished subseque	ntly to this Authority in written form.
			furnished subseque	ntly to this Authority in computer readable form.
			The statement that to in the international a	he subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure pplication as filed has been furnished.
			The statement that the listing has been furn	he information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence ished.
	4.	The	amendments have r	esulted in the cancellation of:
			the description,	pages:
			the claims,	Nos.:
			the drawings,	sheets:

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/GB 03/02763

5. 🗆	This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed (Rule 70.2(c)).
	(Any replacement sheet containing such amendments must be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this report.)

6. Additional observations, if necessary:

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Yes: Claims

No:

1-13

Inventive step (IS)

Yes: Claims

Claims

No: Claims

1-13

Industrial applicability (IA)

Yes: Claims

1-13

.No: Claims

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Re Item V

Reasoned statement under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: WO 98/54441 A D2: WO 99/06891 A D3: GB 2215408 A

- 1) The present application does not meet the criteria of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject-matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step in the sense of Article 33(3) PCT.
- 1.1) The document D1 discloses: (Fig. 1,2; Page 9 line 6 Page 10 line 17)

A method for combatting the formation of emulsions in production fluid, comprising the step of commingling fluid with the production fluid so that the commingled fluid has an oil to water ratio outside a range of oil to water ratios at which emulsions are liable to form.

1.2) The subject-matter of claim 1 therefore differs from this known method in that:

It comprises detecting either (a) a ratio of around 50% oil and 50% water by volume in the production fluid at which emulsions form, or (b) the presence of emulsions in the production fluid.

- 1.3) The problem to be solved by the present invention may therefore be regarded as to detect the presence of emulsions to improve separation efficiency.
 - 1.4) The solution proposed in claim 1 of the present application cannot be considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) as the detection of emulsions in a production fluid is disclosed in document D2 (page 3 line 11 page 4 line 4; page 6 line 8 14; page 19 line 7 10) in order to solve the same problem. The detection feature described in document D2 provides the same advantages as in the present application. The skilled person would therefore regard it as obvious to include this feature in the

EXAMINATION REPORT - SEPARATE SHEET

method described in document D1 in order to solve the problem posed.

- 2) The same reasoning applies, mutatis mutandis, to the subject-matter of the corresponding independent claim 13, which therefore is also considered not inventive.
- 3) Dependant claims 2-12 do not appear to contain any additional features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and/or inventive step, the reasons being as follows:
- Claim 2: D1 discloses a fraction metre and a controlling operation to maintain the ratio above a certain level.
- Claim 3: D1 discloses monitoring of output flows.
- Claim 4: Sensors to detect formation of emulsions are known in the art.
- Claim 5: D1 discloses adjustment of water being recycled.
- Claims 6,7: D1 discloses using recycled water from the separation.
- Claims 8,12: D3 discloses a separation step near the wellhead.
- Claims 9,10,11: D3 discloses a retrievable module usable in a modular seabed processing system.

003 06.08.2004

004 15:48:2

10/518656 DT01 Rec'd PCT/PTC 16 DEC 2004

12

CLAIMS:

1. A method for combating the formation of emulsions in production fluid, comprising the step of commingling fluid with the production fluid so that the commingled fluid has an oil to water ratio outside a range of oil to water ratios at which emulsions are liable to form, and characterised by the step of:

detecting either (a) a ratio of around 50% oil and 50% water by volume in the production fluid at which emulsions form, or (b) the presence of emulsions in the production fluid.

10

5

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the detecting step comprises
the steps of measuring the ratio of oil to water in a production fluid, and detecting
if the oil to water ratio is inside the range of oil to water ratios at which emulsions
are formed.

15

3. The method as claimed in claim 2, wherein the measuring step and subsequent detecting step comprises comparing the volumetric flowrate of oil separated from the production fluid with the volumetric flowrate of water separated from the production fluid.

20

4. The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the detecting step comprises using a nucleonic level sensor or some other appropriate sensor installed in a suitable vessel (16,16',60,60') to detect the formation of emulsions in the production fluid.

25

30

deres to sever

5. The method as claimed in any preceding claim, including the additional step of adjusting the amount of fluid to be commingled with the production fluid in response to the detecting step to maintain the commingled fluid has an oil to water ratio outside a range of oil to water ratios at which emulsions are liable to form.



004

- 6. The method as claimed in any preceding claim, including the additional step of separating a fluid from the production fluid, and the commingling step comprising commingling at least a portion of said fluid separated from the production fluid with the production fluid before the production fluid is detected for emulsions.
- 7. The method as claimed in claim 6, wherein the fluid separated and commingled with the production fluid comprises oil or water.
- 8. The method as claimed in claim 6 or 7, wherein the separating step takes place at a host facility (2) or at or near at least one wellhead (5).
- 9. The method as claimed in claim 6, 7 or 8, wherein the separating step takes place in a retrievable module (7) for use with a modular seabed processing system.
- 10. The method as claimed in any one of claims 6 to 9, wherein both the separating and commingling steps takes place in a retrievable module (7) for use with a modular seabed processing system.
 - 11. The method as claimed in any one of claims 1 to 9, wherein the commingling step takes place in a retrievable module (7) for use with a modular seabed processing system.
 - 12. The method as claimed in any preceding claim, wherein the comminging step takes place at or near at least one wellhead (5).
- 13. A system for combating the formation of emulsions, comprising30 commingling means (10) for commingling fluid with the production fluid so that the



'n

5

10

25

5

005

14

commingled fluid has an oil to water ratio outside the range of oil to water ratios at which emulsions are likely to form, characterised by:

means (22,24,30,42,48,49) for detecting either (a) a ratio of around 50% oil and 50% water by volume in the production fluid at which emulsions form, or (b) the presence of emulsions in the production fluid.

